

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/655,985
Attorney Docket: 46107-0091
Reply to Office Action Dated August 11, 2005

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is in response to the Office Action dated August 11, 2005 wherein the Examiner:

- (i) indicated that claims 2-9, 11-14 and 20 are allowed;
- (ii) rejected claims 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels et al. (US 2004/0083794) ("Daniels") in view of Deutsch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,054,461) ("Deutsch"); and
- (iii) objected to claim 17 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

All the changes are made for clarification and are based on the application and drawings as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-9, 11-14 and 16-20 in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels in view of Deutsch. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejections for the reasons set forth below.

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/655,985
Attorney Docket: 46107-0091
Reply to Office Action Dated August 11, 2005

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention at page 3 of the Office Action that the Deutsch reference discloses a "reset input of said integrator [being] operably connected to an ignition charge pulse" as provided for by the claims at issue. The Examiner points to column 4, lines 10-13 of Deutsch to support his contention. Applicants submit, however, that there is no discussion, disclosure or suggestion in this (or any) section of the Deutsch reference of a "reset input" as provided for by claims 16, 18 and 19.

The Examiner points to element 42 of Deutsch as comprising the "integrator" of the claims. Element 42 of Deutsch is described as a "summing and integration network" and its detail is illustrated in Fig. 2. This figure illustrates that there are three (and only three) inputs to this element - specifically leads 44, 46 and 48 - and that these inputs are connected to coil windings 16, 14 and 12 respectively. However, there is no "reset input" of element 42 in this figure, nor is there any mention of a "reset" or "reset input" in the Deutsch reference whatsoever. Applicants note, in fact, that neither "reset" or "reset input" are present in Deutsch. For these reasons, Applicants submit that Deutsch does not disclose a "reset input" for element 42, let alone a "reset input of said integrator [being] operably connected to an ignition charge pulse" as provided for by the claims at issue.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 2-9, 11-14 and 20 are allowed and that claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since Applicants submit that the claim on which claim 17 depends is patentable over the prior art, as discussed above, Applicants have not rewritten claim 17 in independent form at this time. Applicants note that claim 20 is also dependent on a rejected base claim and, therefore, should have been objected to by the Examiner as such (even

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/655,985
Attorney Docket: 46107-0091
Reply to Office Action Dated August 11, 2005

though this claim would be allowable if rewritten to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim). Similar to claim 17 discussed above, Applicants have not rewritten claim 20 in independent form at this time because Applicants submit that the claim on which claim 20 depends is patentable over the prior art, as discussed above.

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/655,985
Attorney Docket: 46107-0091
Reply to Office Action Dated August 11, 2005

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have responded in a fully satisfactory manner to all matters at issue in this Application, and that this Application is now in condition for allowance. In this regard, Applicants have made every effort to comply with the requirements set forth in the Office Action as well as the statutory requirements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow the pending claims and pass the Application to issue. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 433-7570.


Applicants believe there are no fees due for this document, however, if any fees are due, the Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 04-1061 in the name of Dickinson Wright PLLC.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dickinson Wright PLLC
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Date: November 8, 2005

By: 
Michael A. Schaldenbrand
Reg. No. 47,923

Dickinson Wright PLLC
1901 L Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
(248) 433-7570

MAS/

BILOOMFIELD 46107-91 710733v1